

# **EXHIBIT 4**

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

-----x  
IN RE GOOGLE PLAY STORE Case No.  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION 3:21-md-02981-JD

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO: MDL No. 2891

In re Google Play Consumer  
Antitrust Litigation,  
Case No. 3:20-cv-05761-JD

Epic Games Inc. v. Google LLC,  
et al.,  
Case No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD

-----x  
\*HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY\*

REMOTE VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION BY VIRTUAL ZOOM OF  
JAMES MICKENS  
Wednesday, March 22, 2023

Reported By: Lynne Ledanois, CSR 6811

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

-----x  
IN RE GOOGLE PLAY STORE Case No.  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION 3:21-md-02981-JD

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO: MDL No. 2891

In re Google Play Consumer  
Antitrust Litigation,  
Case No. 3:20-cv-05761-JD

Epic Games Inc. v. Google LLC,  
et al.,  
Case No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD

-----x  
  
Remote videotaped deposition of JAMES  
MICKENS, taken in Boston, Massachusetts, commencing  
at 10:05 a.m. Eastern, on Wednesday, March 22, 2023  
before Lynne Ledanois, Certified Shorthand Reporter  
No. 6811

///

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 3

REMOTE APPEARANCES

Counsel for Plaintiff Epic Games, Inc. in:  
Epic Games, Inc. v Google LLC, et al:

CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP

BY: JUSTIN CLARKE

MIRIAM ROSENBAUM

MEHER BABBAR

Attorneys at Law

825 Eighth Avenue

New York, New York 10019

jclark@cravath.com

mrosenbaum@cravath.com

mbabber@cravath.com

Counsel for the Proposed Class In re: Google  
Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation:

BARTLIT BECK

BY: JOHN BYARS

Attorney at Law

1801 Wewetta Street

Suite 1200

Denver, Colorado 80202

john.byars@bartlitbeck.com

///

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 4

REMOTE APPEARANCES

Counsel for Plaintiff States:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

STATE OF NEW YORK

BY: BENJAMIN J. COLE

Attorney at Law

28 Liberty Street

18th Floor

New York, New York 10005-1495

benjamin.cole@ag.ny.gov

Counsel for Google LLC, et al:

MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON LLP

BY: KURUVILLA OLASA

TED KANG

Attorneys at Law

350 South Grand Avenue

Los Angeles, California 90071

kuruvilla.olasa.@mto.com

ted.kang@mto.com

///

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 5

REMOTE APPEARANCES

Counsel for Plaintiffs Match Group, LLC; Humor  
Rainbow, Inc.; PlentyofFish Media ULC; and People  
Media:

HUESTON HENNIGAN

BY: CHRISTINE WOODIN

JULIA HAINES

Attorneys at Law

523 West 6th Street

Suite 400

Los Angeles, California 90014

cwoodin@hueston.com

jhaines@hueston.com

ALSO PRESENT:

Arzu Mammadova, Keystone Strategy

Stephen Myers, Match Group

Jeanette Teckman, Match Group

Jeffree Anderson, Videographer

Rikki Williams, Veritext Tech

1 browser provides a similar warning?

2 A I do not know.

3 Q Do you know if the Microsoft Edge browser  
4 provides a similar warning?

5 A I do not know.

6 Q Do you think it is reasonable for browser  
7 vendors to provide the warning we see in step 2?

8 MR. CLARKE: Object to form.

9 THE WITNESS: By reasonable, what do you  
10 mean?

11 BY MR. OLASA:

12 Q Do you think it was a good design decision  
13 for browser vendors to include the warning we see in  
14 step 2?

15 A It's reasonable to the extent that the  
16 downloading of an APK file is sort of different in  
17 terms of ramifications than the downloading of a  
18 picture, let's say.

19 Q So you do think it was a good design  
20 decision for browser vendors to include this  
21 warning; right?

22 MR. CLARKE: Object to form.

23 THE WITNESS: Well, I think that in this  
24 case, there is a decision that browser makers are  
25 making here with respect to the potential risk of an

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 163

1 action. So that's why I was bringing up the analogy  
2 with downloading a picture.

3 So to the extent that this warning is  
4 actually commensurate with risk, it's a good idea.  
5 BY MR. OLASA:

6 Q When the browser -- is this warning  
7 commensurate with risk?

8 A Well, I think that it is -- that there is a  
9 higher risk of harm from downloading an APK versus  
10 downloading a picture, for instance.

11 Q So is this warning in step 2 commensurate  
12 with that risk?

13 MR. CLARKE: Object to form.

14 THE WITNESS: It's commensurate in the  
15 sense that it's presenting more friction for a  
16 potentially more dangerous operation.

17 BY MR. OLASA:

18 Q And is it proportional -- is this warning  
19 proportional to the danger from a potentially more  
20 dangerous operation?

21 MR. CLARKE: Object to form.

22 THE WITNESS: I think that this warning  
23 captures the higher likelihood of risk from  
24 downloading an APK versus downloading an image.

25



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 164

1 BY MR. OLASA:

2 Q In providing this warning, the browser has  
3 not made a determination as to whether that  
4 particular APK is or is not harmful; correct?

5 A So that is true. But that is true because  
6 it is required to be true because Android does not  
7 support anything like the notarization counterfactuals  
8 that I describe.

9 So this is another example where sort of  
10 the current affordances of what the browsers can  
11 provide with respect to these types of warnings are  
12 affected by the design choices that Google has made  
13 for how the Android operates.

14 Q There are commercially available virus or  
15 malware scanning tools for Android; correct?

16 A Correct.

17 Q A browser vendor could choose to run an  
18 APK file through those tools and provide the results  
19 of that analysis to the user; correct?

20 MR. CLARKE: Object to form.

21 THE WITNESS: That may not be trivial to  
22 do for architectural reasons. But in theory, for  
23 example, a browser vendor could decide to directly  
24 incorporate an antivirus tool into its own source  
25 code.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 166

1 browser the implementation mechanism for Play  
2 Store 2.0 and therefore they sort of elided the  
3 spirit of the counterfactual proposal by pushing all  
4 the friction there.

5 Q I follow that. I guess my question is a  
6 little different.

7 Your proposal for centralized and  
8 decentralized notarization does not propose  
9 eliminating browser warnings; right?

10 MR. CLARKE: Object to form.

11 THE WITNESS: Well, it doesn't -- my  
12 assignment was to look at Android, the core  
13 platform. And it wasn't to look into the friction  
14 specifically imposed by things like browsers.

15 BY MR. OLASA:

16 Q Okay. And so as a result of that, you  
17 don't have a proposal one way or the other as to  
18 whether browser warnings should be eliminated;  
19 correct?

20 MR. CLARKE: Object to form.

21 THE WITNESS: The counterfactuals I  
22 propose don't address that either which way.

23 BY MR. OLASA:

24 Q All right. So then the user in the  
25 workflow here on Figure 22 clicks "download anyway"

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

Page 337

GOOGLE PLAY STORE ANTITRUST LITIGATION

3/22/2023 - JAMES MICKENS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF DEPONENT

I, JAMES MICKENS, do hereby declare that I have read the foregoing transcript, I have made any corrections, additions, or changes I deemed necessary as noted on the Errata to be appended hereto, and that the same is a true, correct and complete transcript of the testimony given by me.

\_\_\_\_\_  
JAMES MICKENS

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\*If notary is required

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS  
\_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
NOTARY PUBLIC